LAW OFFICES

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON

FAX (816) 421-5547
W.U.T. TELEX 426291 SHB KSC
A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

ONE KANSAS CITY PLACE
1200 MAIN STREET
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI 64105
(816) 474-6550

OTHER OFFICES:
40 CORPORATE WOODS
OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS
19 BUCKINGHAM GATE
LONDON, ENGLAND

JAN 28 1992

January 27, 1992

FOIA

FEDERAL EXPRESS

Dr. Thomas Borelli
Philip Morris Companies, Inc.
120 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Dr. Robert A. Pages
Philip Morris Management Corp.
Science & Technology
Operations Center
P.O. Box 26603
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Re: California Environmental Protection Agency: Risk Assessment on ETS

Dear Tom and Bob:

On Thursday, January 23, 1992 the California Scientific Review Panel on Toxic Air Contaminants met for the purposes of proceeding pursuant to the agenda which is attached. The following members of the SRP were in attendance:

Dr. James Seiber
Dr. Gary Friedman
Dr. Stanton Glantz
Dr. Hanspeter Witschi
Dr. James Pitts (Chairman)
Dr. Charles Becker
Dr. John Froines
Dr. Thomas Davis
Dr. Craig Byus

The two purposes of the meeting of relevance were to review the Toxic Air Contaminants Risk Assessment on 1,3-Butadiene and to discuss the preparation of a risk assessment on environmental tobacco smoke. George Alexev of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (AHA) indicated during the meeting that there were discussions between AHA and the Air Resources Board (ARB) to determine who would perform the risk assessment for ETS, and that it would probably be undertaken "in the spring". He apparently indicated that the Cal-EPA risk

2024725722

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/jqjj0000

assessment would "piggyback" on the U.S. EPA's risk assessment on ETS.

It was apparently determined to send a letter to the Prop. 99 Committee (the committee with oversight responsibilities regarding the tobacco tax) urging the use of Prop. 99 money for ETS monitoring and risk assessment. The meeting also addressed the possibility of a letter to Cal-EPA requesting that the Scientific Review Panel, rather than the Prop. 65 panel be the review panel for the ETS study on risk assessment because more than just cancer and reproductive effects (which are items covered under Prop. 65) should be examined in the ETS risk assessment.

Some additional materials, including an executive summary concerning the proposed identification of 1,3-Butadiene as a toxic air contaminant are enclosed.

Sincerely,

Leo P. Dreyer

LPD:jpm
Enclosures

cc: Steven C. Parrish, Esq. (w/o encl.)
Denise F. Keane, Esq. (w/o encl.)

2024725723

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/jqjj0000